June 29, 1999

DSSD CENSUS 2000 PROCEDURES AND OPERATIONS MEMORANDUM SERIES R-13

MASTER FILE

MEMORANDUM FOR   Richard Blass
Assistant Division Chief for Evaluation
and Integrated Coverage Measurement
Field Division

From: Donna Kostanich
Assistant Division Chief, Sampling and Estimation
Decennial Statistical Studies Division

Prepared by: Ryan Cromar R C
Sample Design Team

Subject: Census 2000 Post-Enumeration Survey: Updated County Sample
Size Estimates-Reissue

This memorandum is being reissued for inclusion in the official *DSSD Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum Series*. All text in the version of this memorandum distributed on February 24, 1999 remains the same in this version. **Some sample sizes estimates documented in this memorandum are obsolete. See memorandum R-14 of this series for the sample size estimates for the Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation survey.**

Introduction

The Sample Design Team prepared and delivered county estimates of the Post-Enumeration Survey (PES) listing workloads for Census 2000 as documented in [1]. These numbers can be used to get an indication of how the PES listing work will be distributed across counties in a state. The purpose for this memorandum is to update the county listing workloads. Block cluster allocations for six states in the Midwest need to be updated to improve reliability for the PES estimates. We are increasing the sample sizes in Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois. To compensate, we are lowering the sample sizes in West Virginia, Indiana, and Wisconsin. The table below presents the changes in block cluster allocation and relative changes for each of these states. The allocations and county workloads for all other states have not changed.

Table. Changes in Listing Allocation for each of the Affected States

Regional Office	State	Original Sample		Updated Sample		Relative Change
		Block Cluster	Listing HUs	Block Cluster	Listing HUs	
Detroit	Michigan	317	20,155	379	24,105	1.196
Detroit	Ohio	358	26,183	421	30,791	1.176
Detroit	West Virginia	425	24,872	300	17,560	0.706
Chicago	Indiana	300	17,373	275	15,931	0.917
Chicago	Illinois	380	27,900	430	31,583	1.132
Chicago	Wisconsin	300	15,777	275	14,468	0.917

Assumptions/Limitations

As stated in [1], here are several assumptions and limitations in computing the PES 2000 listing sample sizes for each county.

- Proportional allocation based on 1990 Census data was used to compute sample sizes for each county within each state.
- We assumed that the housing unit distribution across counties within each state does not change between 1990 and 2000.
- We assumed the state allocation of block clusters documented in [2] with the exception of the updated changes listed above.
- These county workloads are for blocks with at least three housing units in 1990. No small block estimates were computed.
- The listing workloads assume that large block clusters will be oversampled and then the housing units will be subsampled to yield roughly 30 housing units to be interviewed per cluster.
- The additional sample of 350 block clusters recommended in [2] for American Indian Reservations was not included in this analysis. If we were to include this additional sample, the sample and workload will increase in counties with American Indian Reservations.
- Housing unit follow-up workload and Person follow-up workload were not factored in this analysis.
- Puerto Rico estimates are not included in workloads.

Results

The state listing workloads were proportionally allocated to each county and were saved to a spreadsheet. The name of the spreadsheet is titled 2kctywk2.wk4. We will provide the Lotus spreadsheet file to Jan Jaworski and Neala Stevens of your staff via cc:mail. If there are any questions, please contact either Ryan Cromar (x1636) or Jim Farber (x4282).

Filename '2k2mfld2.wpd';

References

[1] Memorandum for Blass from Kostanich, "Census 2000 ICM : County Sample Size Estimates."

[2] Memorandum for Killion from Schindler, "Allocation of the ICM Sample for Census 2000," May 6, 1997.

cc:
Sample Design Team